Mr. David Morgalick
New York Times
229 W. 43 St.,
New York, N.Y. 10036

11/29/88

Dear Mr. Morgalick,

First I explain why I write you so soon when it is so awkward for me.

I'm an early riser, begin my day making a pot of coffee and sitting and thinking about what I'll do each day. I'd intended filing information in a file on how the media treated the JFK assassination anniversary. I'm collecting this file for the use of others in the future, to be part of this large archive that will be a permanent, public archive at local Hood College. As I may not have told you, I've not been pursuing a whodunit. I've made a large study of how out major institutions functioned or failed to function in the time of great stress and since then. My conclusion is that in varying degree all failed, endangering our system and its freedoms. Our press, I believe, also failed us, then and since.

I've observed an increasing authoritarianism beginning with the JFK assassination, and this troubles me, particularly because I am the first member of my family going back into the remotest past to be born into freedom. (This figures in the dedication of my first book.) I was also troubled when in speaking to college audiences as truthfully as I could I had to paint a bleak picture of these failings, mostly of the government. In thinking about this I was able to tell these impressionable young minds that governments are made up of men, men are human and ~~fail~~ err so governments also err. I'd then point out that were I in the USSR I'd be lucky if I were only placed in a psychiatric ward and that were I in any of the British commonwealth countries I'd be jailed under the official secrets act. So, despite its failings, our system is the one under which men have greatest freedom. And that criticism helps to correct errors and failings.

I did not plan any further writing on the JFK assassination, although I did plan a book on the nonpublishing history of my first, "Dick Daring In the Hellbox, or How I got rich In Six Months," then "Tiger To Ride," on the Kennedy presidency, both researched. The concerns I note above are one of the reasons I countinued working on the assassinations.

My persistence in this, including persisting under FOIA, led to the amending of the Act in 1974. With regard to the investigatory files exemption, this is explicit in the legislative history, although no paper reported it. This persistence, in which I did what few requesters did, litigated rather than accepting what the agencies let me have when I knew they had more, got me about a third of a million pages.

In going over those from the FBI I was slow to perceive some of the duplicate filings noted marginally. Too late to have what I'd like to have I tumbled to the

significance of the "94" filings, I never got a "record" copy of any 94 file although some of those I did get were copies of records where the record or indexed copy was a 94. I still do not know the full extent of what 94 covers but it does cover the press, all elements, lobbying and such things as J. Edgar Hoover's correspondence. This has to be a truly massive collection of files on the press from what I've been able to segregate. And in no instance was any a law enforcement file. I note this in part because FOIA's exemptions extend only to files compiled for law enforcement purposes.

I do not know whether this began under Lou Nichols but I do know that under Cartha DeLoach it was a truly big thing. I have these duplicate copies in a subject file I keep under DeLoach. (I think it did begin under Nichols, though.) I do know that it includes preparations for blackmail, for example, allegations that a well-known TV reporter was a drunk. In this regard, please note some of the items in the tickler I sent you, the preparations of dossiers on the members of the Commission and twice on its staff, the second after their report was out, and what is understated, the preparation of sex dossiers on the critics. From this trash heap, for another example, the FBI told the White House what is quite false and had no basis at all, that my wife and I annually celebrated the Russian revolution with a gathering of 35 strangers at our home. You can imagine how the White House reacted. The FBI liked this so much that they made wider distribution of this and other fabrications, including to those who defended my FOIA litigation and the Congress. (The closest thing we can figure is that when we farmed, after the high holidays the Jewish Welfare Board brought Washington area service personnel and their families to our farm for an outing where the kids could gather eggs, see chicks hatch and play with them and ride on tame livestock. These Jewish holidays do not coincide in time with the Russian revolution so even that disqualification of the libel did not discourage its use.)

De Loach's division was known as "Crime Records." Obviously what I refer to has nothing at all to do with crime. The classification of 94 is "Research Matters," misuse of this Orwellian title is one basis for the FBI's steadfast refusal to disclose records in the 94 files to me in court. It had the solid support of the DJ lawyers handling the litigation.

Organizations also are included, the ACLU, for example. The enclosed record is in a "main" or "indexed" (not synonymous) file with the duplicate filing, marked "not recorded" not indexed in the central filing system. Crime Records, however, also gets records not indexed 94, an example that may amuse you also enclosed. This record, which also discloses the papers always clipped, was considered important enough to go to Hoover's top two assistants and several other divisions, including general investigative and domestic intelligence. (Notations made by Hoover.)

The press also was manipulated, including the major papers and magazines and

they planned books to say what they wanted said about major events, like the assassination of Dr. King, which I have nailed tight, and they know writers they are certain will write what they want written. They discuss this freely, never expecting a devil or scripture. Ditto for magazines. They used Jeremiah O'Leary, then on the defunct Washington Star, to write the story they wanted written about James Warl Ray, for one of their favorite magazines, Readers Digest. He did it and it was a major influence in aborting the trial the FBI not only didn't want and knew would seriously embarrass it. I got from the FBI the intercepted copy of Ray's complaining letter to the judge, copied before it went into the mails. (Also the judge's copy.) While O'Leary may be an extreme case, he was, in fact, an FBI operative against his colleagues in the press in Dallas. So, he was always favored and his career and his income benefitted.

When this kind of special treatment was afforded in the field offices their copies are filed in 80 files, classification "laboratory research matters." These, to the best of my knowledge, are never filed in the 80 files in the field offices but are in the "main" or "case" files and thus the FBI steadfastly refuses to search for or disclose field office 80 files.

Once I began making demands for 94 records without question relevant, in xeroxing for me they omitted marginal notations in the xeroxing and when this did not do the trick they redacted those notations. The hell with the law that limits withholdings to files compiled for law enforcement purpose when they want to avoid exposure and embarrassment. They know better than the law or and legislators.

They also know better than the drafters of the Constitution.

This and indifference to it by the courts, the Congress and the press do concern me and that is why I write you. I want you to know in the hope that it might interest you and the Times and if it does not so you might inform others who might be interested in what I regard as police-state practises.

I can help anyone who might use FOIA to get this certainly vast amount of information much of which will be withheld absent litigation, which can be taxing, expensive and difficult and will, without question, be stonewalled. To the degree I can I'll help anyone wanting help and I'm sure that Jim Lesar, who handled almost all my FOIA cases, will also.

I'm not suggesting all 94 files. That would be defeated in court, I think, and if not would require a very large building merely for storage.

Cases of manipulation I recall having involve the Washington Post and Star. The Post matter I recall was a successful effort to keep it from endorsing the formation of the Warren Commission (again, recall, please, that tickler outline). and with the Star, a rather sordid story of how critics were to be frustrated.

This may or may not, and from the records I have it does not, include the copy of the manuscript of my second book when Harrison Salisbury mailed it back to me. I never got it. (By no means a unique experience.) They arranged, DeLoach and his minions, for the Star's then city editor, Epstein, to sign a letter they drafted for him, asking questions to which Hoover did respond, first an exclusive to the Star. The Times then printed it verbatim. It does attempt to rebut what had not been published earlier and is in my second book. However, the final product was the FBI's alteration of LBJ's request that Hoover do a book putting us all down.

I regard these kinds of things by a police agency, which the FBI claims it isn't, as at least a corruption of our system and more likely a subversion of it. I regard it as more serious an offense when it involves the assassination of a president, any president, which has the effect of a coup d'etat whatever the intent of the assassins may have been.

If and when you come here, as I hope you do, you will,,of course, have free and unsupervised access to all these records and you can make copies on our copier.

If there is no other interest, there should be the making of a worthwhile doctoral thesis for which, perhaps, there might be foundation or other support.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg

Harold Weisberg